

REMARKS

With the cancellation of claims 1 to 9 and 11 to 19, without prejudice herein, claims 10 and 20 to 37 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable for the following reasons and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the receipt of the information disclosure statement, PTO 1449 and references cited therein.

I. Rejection of Claims 34 to 37 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 34 to 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 34 to 37 are consistent with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for the following reasons.

The Office Action alleges that claim 34 recites the limitation of "The screen assembly" in line 1 and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim as claim 34 is an independent claim.

Applicants have amended claim 34 to provide antecedent basis for all of the features of the claim. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as the claims are fully consistent with the requirements cited therein.

II. Double Patenting Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Office Action rejects claims 1 to 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 to copending application number 10/652,740. The office action states that this is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not, in fact, been patented.

In response, applicants have canceled claims 1 to 9 and 11 to 19 in the present application. Applicants further submit that claim 10, as recited herein, is different than any of the required features in copending application number 10/652,740. Claim 10 has been amended such that it has been placed in

independent form and applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is allowable as recited.

As applicants have canceled claims 1 to 9 and 11 to 19 in the present application, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to these claims.

III. Allowable Claims

The Office Action notes that claims 22 to 33 are allowed. The Office Action further notes that claim 34 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as set forth in the Office Action. Moreover, claims 35 to 37 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended claim 34 as provided above and therefore submit that claim 34 is allowable. Claims 35 to 37 depend from allowable claim 34 and therefore are allowable for the reasons presented above in relation to claim 34.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims of the present application are now in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 4/24/06

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "John M. Vereb", is written over a horizontal line.

John M. Vereb
Reg. No. 48,912

One Broadway.
New York, NY 10004

(212) 425-7200 (telephone)

CUSTOMER NO. 26646